



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,436	07/08/2003	Satoshi Kawase	JP9-1999-0099US2	7462
25259	7590	11/03/2005	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION			ENGLAND, DAVID E	
3039 CORNWALLIS RD.				
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709			2143	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/615,436	KAWASE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David E. England	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 4, 8 and 13 – 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 4, 8 and 13 – 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 4, 8 and 13 – 23 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 4, 8 and 13 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Markus in view of Dipaolo et al. (5367619) (hereinafter Dipaolo).

4. Referencing claim 4, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Markus teaches an information processing method in an information processing system having an information terminal support server which supports an information terminal connected to a content server and loaded with a client program, the method comprising the steps of:

5. (a) receiving, at the information terminal support server, a message sent from the content server responding to a request from the information terminal, wherein the message includes content, (e.g., col. 16, lines 8 – 28);

6. (b) determining whether or not said message agrees with a predetermined condition, (e.g., col. 5, lines 13 – 44 & col. 9, lines 19 – 34)

Art Unit: 2143

7. (c) editing said message to insert a command in association with the content for the client program if said message agrees with said predetermined condition, wherein the command is executable at the information terminal of the client program with respect to the content, (e.g., col. 15, line 41 – col. 16, line 28); and

8. (d) sending said message in edited form to the information terminal, (e.g., col. 15, line 41 – col. 16, line 28), but does not specifically teach prohibiting a behavior. Dipaolo teaches prohibiting a behavior, (e.g., col. 11, lines 31 – 68). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dipaolo with Markus because if a field in a form is marked for protection then it would be used to stop users from mistakenly changing values in fields that could cause errors in the system and also protect a field that is automatically set such as a automatic menu field.

9. Referencing claim 14, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Markus teaches the content is a specified field and wherein the behavior is displaying the specified field, (e.g., col. 15, line 41 – col. 16, line 28).

10. As per claim 15, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Markus teaches the content is a form but does not specifically teach wherein the behavior is alteration of the form. Dipaolo teaches wherein the behavior is alteration of the form, (e.g., col. 11, lines 31 – 68). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dipaolo with Markus because if a field in a form is marked for protection then it would be used

to stop users from mistakenly changing values in fields that could cause errors in the system and also protect a field that is automatically set such as a automatic menu field.

11. As per claim 16, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Markus teaches the content is a form but does not specifically teach wherein the behavior is submission of the form. Dipaolo teaches wherein the behavior is submission of the form, (e.g., col. 11, lines 31 – 68). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dipaolo with Markus because if a field in a form is marked for protection then it would be used to stop users from mistakenly changing values in fields that could cause errors in the system and also protect a field that is automatically set such as a automatic menu field.

12. Referencing claim 17, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Markus teaches a message sender that sends the message in edited form to the information terminal, (e.g., col. 15, line 41 – col. 16, line 28).

13. Claims 8, 13 and 18 – 23 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4, 8, 13 – 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

15. Applicant is invited to contact the Examiner for any clarification to claim interpretation and possible amendment ideas to overcome the prior art.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

17. a. Selvin et al. U.S. Patent No. 6718329 discloses Method and apparatus for generating typed nodes and links in a hypertext database from formation documents.

18. b. Lynch et al. U.S. Patent No. 6558431 discloses Storing valid and invalid markup language in strict and relaxed tables respectively.

19. c. Tso et al. U.S. Patent No. 6047327 discloses System for distributing electronic information to a targeted group of users.

20. d. Heidorn et al. U.S. Patent No. 6098081 discloses Hypermedia navigation using soft hyperlinks.

21. e. Geller et al. U.S. Patent No. 6300948 discloses Methods and systems for user interfaces and constraint handling in configuration software.

22. f. Lau et al. U.S. Patent No. 5892510 discloses Field objects and a method for developing a graphical user interface containing the field objects.

23. g. Greer et al. U.S. Patent No. 5978828 discloses URL bookmark update notification of page content or location changes.

Art Unit: 2143

24. h. Ayyadurai U.S. Patent No. 6718368 discloses System and method for content-sensitive automatic reply message generation for text-based asynchronous communications.

25. i. Shibata et al. U.S. Patent No. 5835923 discloses Contents information transmitting/viewing system and method therefor.

26. j. Shibata U.S. Patent No. 5966718 discloses Document processing system with enable feature.

27. k. Albert et al. U.S. Patent No. 5991410 discloses Wireless adaptor and wireless financial transaction system.

28. l. Narayanaswamy U.S. Patent No. 6611358 discloses Document transcoding system and method for mobile stations and wireless infrastructure employing the same.

29. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

De



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100